

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 24, 2004 LB 479, 1065

prorated, it would not be fair to them, and I think we've got to do something to stop something that goes far beyond what the intent of LB 536 was. If this is just talking about the applications for the incentives, I would have to agree with it and be in opposition to the amendment. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Kremer. Senator Hartnett.

SENATOR HARTNETT: Members...Mr. President, members of the body. I'm opposed to the amendment too. Senator Baker, can you ask...answer a question for me? When we put a new ethanol plant on line, when we start that, how much does it cost the state?

SENATOR BAKER: If they qualify for the full...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Baker.

SENATOR BAKER: ...incentive payment, 8 years, 96 months of payment, it's \$22.5 million per plant.

SENATOR HARTNETT: Twenty-two? That's over the eight-year period.

SENATOR BAKER: Yes, sir.

SENATOR HARTNETT: And how many, when we passed 4...I think it was 4...was that Senator...or...

SENATOR BAKER: LB 536 was the (inaudible).

SENATOR HARTNETT: LB 536, how many plants after that date, Senator Baker, have come on line or are going to get...are going to qualify for this?

SENATOR BAKER: I'd say there are four plants that are going to legitimately qualify for LB 536 credits of \$22.5 million apiece, so that's obviously \$90 million total.

SENATOR HARTNETT: And that's.. how do we pay for that?

SENATOR BAKER: That's the point of LB 1065 is to pay for those